REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of this application. Claims 1-25 remain pending.

Anticipation Rejections under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e), as being anticipated by Orr et al. (Orr) (U.S. Pat. 6,463,459). The rejection is respectfully traversed. For the reasons put forth below, Applicant respectfully asserts that Orr fails to identically disclose each and every feature specified in independent claim 1.

In support of the 35 U.S.C § 102(e) rejection the Examiner asserts that Orr et al. (hereafter Orr) teaches a method for enabling access to resources connected to client nodes of a network. This assertion is incorrect. In fact, Orr teaches a system in which a remote requester may initiate a command to run on a server for an associated virtual desktop (Column 3, lines 6-8). The Examiner alleges that the client computers and the servers in Orr to be the same as the local client and the remote client in the claimed invention. This allegation is misplaced. In the claimed invention the functions of the local client and the remote client can be interchanged. The local client may function as a server to provide services to the remote client. Likewise, the remote client can function as a server to provide services to local client. Moreover in Orr, all the processing is done by the server and none by the client. The user accesses the server through the client and the client acts as a virtual desktop that does not do any processing and therefore will not be able to function as a server. Thus, the server and the client in Orr are not interchangeable.

Next, in support of the of 35 U.S.C § 102(e) rejection, the Examiner noted that the user logs onto the client system, inherently requiring a username and password which initiates a session with remote client. This further invokes a VP agent process on the

server to provide log-on information to VP broker on the server to initiate a virtual desktop. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of Orr. Specifically, there is nothing inherent in Orr that requires a username and password and which initiates a session with the remote client. To be accurate, Orr states that each time a user logs onto a client, a virtual desktop is created. The virtual desktop is defined as any user logged on session in a multi-user environment. There is nothing in Orr suggesting that the user might be required to provide a username and a password (col. 3, lines 40-44).

According to Orr, a first process, a virtual process broker, executes on the server and communicates with a second process, a virtual process agent, also executed on the server. The VP agent is started within each virtual desktop (Column 3, lines 47-51) which shows that the VP agent is started after the virtual desktop is created contrary to the Examiner's characterization. The logon information provided by the VP agent to the VP broker is not a prerequisite to initiate the virtual desktop. However assuming that the Examiner's assertion that Orr teaches requiring a username and password (a proposition which is inaccurate as shown above), still those teachings are not the same as what is claimed. In the claimed invention, a client identification and a password is provided by the local client to the remote client using a distributed component object model (DCOM) enabled link. Whereas in Orr, if a remote request is from a remote system connected over a network, the server passes the request to the VP broker i.e. a process, using a communication method such as the DCOM (Column 6, lines 40-44). Clearly, in Orr, the client identification and the password are not provided using a DCOM enabled link. In Orr, the server passes the request to the VP broker using a DCOM method.

Next, the Examiner asserts that a confirmation of password occurs when the VP broker provides confirmed inter-process communication (IPC) resources. Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. In fact, the VP broker uses the username to update

the VP broker database with an active status for the specified user name so that, when the VP broker receives a remote request, the VP broker validates the request by determining whether the status field associated with the user is active or inactive (column 6, lines 17-20 and lines 59-61). Moreover, there is nothing in Orr suggesting that the VP broker confirms the username prior to allocating IPC resources to the VP agent. As a matter of fact, when the VP broker receives request for IPC resources from the VP agent the VP broker assigns IPC resources and provides the IPC resources to the VP agent (Column 6, lines 1-6). Furthermore, IPC resources include shared memory buffers and dedicated events, which may be used by the VP agent to communicate with the VP broker. It can be seen quite clearly, that the allocation of IPC resources by the VP broker, a process, in response to a request by the VP agent, a process, is not a confirmation from the remote client that the remote client identification code and password match, as stated by the Examiner.

The Examiner further states that connecting the local client to the selected adapter is inherently required in Orr for local client to execute commands on remote client. Applicant respectfully disagrees. According to Orr, when the server receives a command request the server directs the command request to the VP broker. The VP broker determines whether the requested user is logged on. If the requested user is logged on, the VP broker determines the virtual desktop associated with the requested user (Column 4, lines 4-6). In Orr, the programs are run using the VP agent and not by establishing connection to a selected adapter and connecting the local client to the selected adapter as disclosed in the claimed invention. Depending on the type of request, the request is either handled by the VP broker or the VP agent.

Additionally, the Examiner states that the virtual desktops i.e. GUIs of Orr show all applications and peripherals connected to the remote client, the server, as if they were located on the local client. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's

characterization of Orr et al. Figure 1, clearly shows that virtual desktops are not GUIs as stated by the Examiner. Specifically, Orr states that for a thin-client server architecture, processing for the virtual desktop is performed in the server and the graphical display for the virtual desktop is provided by the thin client (Column 3, lines 44-47). Basically, the client provides an input/output avenue for the user. Moreover, the teachings of Orr is incapable of providing user access to peripheral devices connected to the server. In Orr the server runs a plurality of virtual desktops and each of the virtual desktops is unable to communicate with each other (Claim 1). The VP broker running on the server communicates with the remote requester and the VP agent running within the virtual desktops. When the VP broker receives a command request the VP broker determines whether the user associated with the command request is logged on and if the user is logged on then the VP broker forwards the request to the VP agent associated with the command request. The VP agent then initates any action requested in the command request (summary of the invention). The server in Orr, orchestrates all the client requests using the VP broker.

As Orr fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, is patentable under 35 U.S.C §102(e) over Orr. As claim 6 depends directly from claim 1, Claim 6 is patentable over Orr for the reasons stated above. With respect to Guheen, Guheen does not teach all the features of claim 6. For example, Guheen does not disclose providing a remote client identification and a password to remote client using a DCOM enabled link. As Guheen fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention, the Applicant submits that the dependent claim 6 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for the same reason set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 6.

Obviousness Rejections under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a)

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr as applied to claim 1, in view of Guheen et al. (Guheen) (U.S. Pat. 6,615,166). Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr as applied to claim 1, in view of Kempf et al. (Kempf) (U.S. Pat. 6,374,308). Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr as applied to claim 1 above, in view of McNeill Jr. et al. (McNeill) (U.S. Pat. 5,721,880). Claims 12, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr in view of McNeill. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr-McNeill as applied to claim 15 in view of Kempf. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr-McNeill as applied to claim 12 in view of (Guheen). Claims 21, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr in view of McNeill, and Kempf. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr in view of McNeill, Kempf, and Guheen.

As explained in detail above, Orr fails to teach each and every feature of the independent Claim 1, of the claimed invention. Similarly, at least for the reasons stated above Orr fails to teach each and every feature of the independent claims 12 and 21. Claims 2-3 depend directly from claim 1. It can be seen from above that the server in Orr orchestrates all the remote requester requests and the requests from the clients using the VP broker which is in sharp contrast with the independent claim 1 of the claimed invention. As such, applying Orr to Guheen would not have resulted in a method for accessing resources connected to client nodes of network. Guheen does nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr. Claims 2-3 depend directly from claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-3 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1 therefore, at least for the above stated reasons with respect to Orr, claims 4-5 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). By completely ignoring that in the claimed application where the remote client and the local client may switch their functions as the client and the server, the Examiner has failed to indicate how the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Furthermore, "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). A statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been within the ordinary skill of the art at the time the claimed invention was made is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). Here the Examiner cannot reasonably say that switching a client to be a server and the server to be a client, is an obvious modification, especially, in light of Orr. As explained in detail above, the server in Orr cannot be switched with the client as the server orchestrates all the client request using the VP broker. All the clients in Orr access a particular server. The same applies to Guheen where a user only has access to information stored in the web server. It is unreasonable for the Examiner to suggest it is obvious in Guheen to switch the web server to become a client and the client to become the web server.

Kempf teaches a method to create a connection between a GUI and a statically-typed distributed object (column 3 lines 55-56). The adapter object performs functions such as data translation. (Column 5, lines 26-29). The Office here is mistakenly making the assumption that the adapter object in Kempf and the adapters in the claimed invention to be the same. Kempf describes adapter objects which in a client/server distributed objects environment, instantiate on demand server objects that service remote client

method invocations. The adapter object deals with activation of objects. Moreover, Kempf teaches that a connection is established between adapter object and a surrogate object by setting an outlet instance variable of the adapter object to point to the surrogate object (column 5, lines 57-60). In contrast, the present invention teaches SCSI host adapters that look for connected devices and has nothing to do with object activation as described in Kempf. As a result, the combination of Orr and Kempf would not have taught the Applicant's claimed invention wherein a local client connects to a selected adapter of the remote client as if the selected adapter of the remote client were physically connected to the local client.

The Applicant did not mischaracterize the features the Examiner pointed out with respect to Kempf. Again Applicant emphasizes that Kempf does not teach the use of a GUI to provide access to components. The GUI is used to establish connection between GUI object and surrogate object. Again GUI object is a dynamically typed object (Column 5, lines 25-26) and the surrogate object is a statically typed C++ object, and the surrogate object can be used as a local proxy for a distributed object (Column 5, lines 38-41). The analogy used by the Examiner of GUI object and surrogate object to components, is incorrect. In contrast, in the claimed invention, the adapters connected the remote client appear on GUI of the local client. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1, therefore, at least for the reasons state above, claims 7-8 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr, in view of Kempf. Moreover, Kempf does nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr.

Guheen teaches a system, and method for providing a web architecture framework and for conveying various aspects of such web architecture framework (column 6 lines 55-59). The system provides a way to improve an existing network framework by prioritizing the existing components. In Guheen, the user identification and the passwords may be used to access each component in the system or to access the whole

system (Column 148 lines 59-62). In Guheen, the user only has access to information stored in the web server. In contrast, in the claimed invention when a user at the local client wishes to communicate with the remote client the user double clicks on the remote client icon. When the remote client icon is double clicked, the remote SCSI connection GUI appears on the local client. The user then inputs a remote client identification (ID) and password specific to the local client. If the ID and password match then the local client communicates with a selected SCSI host adapter of the remote client and uses the selected SCSI host adapter as if the selected SCSI host adapter belonged to the local client. In the claimed invention, SCSI host adapters look for peripheral devices connected to the remote client and provide local client access to those peripheral devices. Thus, it is submitted that the combination of Guheen with Orr would not have rendered the claimed invention obvious. Moreover, Guheen does nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr.

McNeill teaches a SCSI emulation device and system for providing access to non-SCSI devices or SCSI devices on a non-local SCSI bus via a common SCSI bus. Furthermore, in McNeill, the target system includes a device emulation code that emulates the targeted peripheral device local to SCSI target computer (Abstract). Also, the initiator uses a standard input/output device driver for the given device and the target uses emulation code with redirection and/or translation routines to look like a standard SCSI device (Column 3 lines 28-30). In the claimed invention the local client establishes communication with the remote client using a DCOM enabled link and not through a SCSI bus. DCOM is a logical implementation that replaces the local interprocess communication provided by an operating system of a client with a network protocol. The network protocol allows direct connection between a local client and a remote client without the need for an intermediary system component. Therefore, it is submitted that one having ordinary skill in the art, reading the teachings of McNeill

would not have been motivated to modify a SCSI emulation device using a common SCSI bus between an initiator and a target, that utilizes emulation code to look like a standard SCSI device, to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. It is further submitted that the combination of Orr with McNeill would not have rendered the claimed invention obvious. Moreover, McNeill does nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr.

The Examiner has incorrectly asserted that access to adapters are inherently required for local client to run programs and access files on a server. Also, the Examiner has incorrectly asserted that user logs on to the client system, inherently requiring a username and password. The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999). "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis in original). The Applicant's submit that the Examiner has failed to provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning that supports a determination that the access to adapters are inherently required for local client to run programs and access files on a server. Also, the Examiner has failed to provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning that supports that a username and password are inherently required for a user to log onto the client system.

Additionally, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on a combination of references, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references or in the knowledge generally available to one having ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references in the manner proposed. As explained above, the Examiner has not established *prima facie* case of obviousness against the claimed subject matter because one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Orr, Guheen , Kempf and McNeill.

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Orr, Guheen, Kempf, and McNeill does not raise *a prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in independent claims 12, and 21 because: 1) the combination is based on an improper comparison of local client and remote client in the claimed invention with the client and the server of Orr, 2) the requisite motivation to combine Orr, Guheen, Kempf and McNeill in the manner proposed by the Examiner is lacking, and 3) Guheen, Kempf and McNeill do nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr.

Thus Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 12 and 21. In a like manner, dependent claims 2-5, 7,8, and 9-11 which incorporate each and every element of the independent claim 1 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of the cited prior art for at least the same reasons discussed above. For the same reasons, dependent claims 13-20 which incorporate each and every element of the independent claim 12, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of the cited prior art. Similarly, dependent claims 22-25 which are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of the cited prior art since dependent claims 22-25 incorporate each and every element of the independent claim 21.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900 Ext 6926. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ROXIP142). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP

Jaya Nair

Jaya Nair, Esq.
Reg. No. 46,454

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 25920